

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Gunnison Field Office  
DOI-BLM-CO-S060-2010-0017-EA**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-CO-S060-2010-0017-EA

**CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:**

Allotment Number 06030

**PROJECT NAME:** East Middle Fork Allotment #06030 Grazing Permit Issuance

**PLANNING UNIT:**

Gunnison Resource Area Resource Management Plan (RMP) Management Unit(s) 16

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** New Mexico Principal Meridian,  
T.47N, R.5W, portions of sections 24 and 25

**APPLICANT:** East Middle Fork Allotment #06030 Permittee

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

**A. BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION:** The East Middle Fork Allotment is located approximately 12 miles south of Cimarron, Colorado in Gunnison County. The East Middle Fork Allotment consists of 50 BLM acres and 623 private acres (owned by the current permit holder) within one pasture. Due to its' small size, large amount of private land, and lack of accessibility for livestock grazing, the East Middle Fork Allotment is managed as a "C" (custodial) allotment. The current permit is as follows:

Livestock		Season of Use	% P.L.	AUMs
No.	Kind/Class			
5	Cattle	6/15 – 10/14	100*	20

\* This allotment is recorded as 100% BLM; however, less than 10% of the land in the allotment is public.

A land health determination was completed for this allotment in 2009. The Responsible Official determined that the allotment is meeting all land health standards.

**B. PURPOSE AND NEED:** The purpose of the proposed action is to issue one permit that authorizes livestock grazing on the East Middle Fork Allotment #06030 such that livestock grazing 1) is in compliance with the Gunnison Resource Area Resource Management Plan (RMP) objectives, 2) achieves or makes significant progress towards achieving the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado and complies with the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing

Management in Colorado, in conformance with the Fundamentals of Rangeland Health (43 CFR 4180.1) and Standards and Guidelines (43 CFR 4180.2) and 3) meets the habitat objectives of Canada lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy. This action is needed now because livestock grazing on the East Middle Fork Allotment is currently being authorized under the authority of the 2004 Appropriations Act (Public Law 108-108).

**C. DECISION TO BE MADE:** The BLM will decide what specific livestock and vegetation management actions will be implemented to continue to authorize livestock grazing in compliance with the RMP and Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado.

**D. SCOPING AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:** On August 3, 2009, scoping letters requesting any information concerning the allotment were sent to the permittee and 83 other entities, including 4 federal and state agencies, 43 private individuals/entities, and 36 organizations.

**E. ISSUES AND CONCERNS:**

The following issues and concerns were identified through public scoping comments and interdisciplinary team review of the proposed action.

**1. Issues to be Analyzed**

These are issues that will help make a reasoned choice between alternatives or that may be related to a potentially significant effect.

- a. Cultural Resources – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on cultural resources?
- b. Migratory Birds – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on migratory birds?
- c. Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on threatened, endangered, and sensitive species?

**2. Issues Not Analyzed**

See Appendix A for a discussion of other resources that either were not present or that were not affected to a degree that warranted detailed analysis.

**II. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

**A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION (Continue Current Management)**

The proposed action is to issue a grazing permit on the East Middle Fork Allotment for a period of 10 years. The permit would be issued with the same livestock numbers and season of use that are currently permitted.

The permit would include the following terms and conditions, goals, and objectives to achieve allotment specific objectives, that will, 1) meet the Gunnison Resource Area Resource Management Plan (RMP) objectives, and 2) achieve or make significant progress towards achieving the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado and comply with the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management in Colorado, in conformance with the Fundamentals of Rangeland Health (43 CFR 4180.1) and Standards and Guidelines (43 CFR 4180.2):

Livestock		Season of Use	% P.L.	AUMs
No.	Kind/Class			
55	Cattle	6/15 – 10/14	9%	20

1. Uplands will not exceed a utilization level of 40-60% of the current years' growth for key forage species during the grazing period of use.
2. Any objects or sites of cultural or paleontological value, such as historic or prehistoric resources, graves or grave markers, human remains, ruins, cabins, rock art, fossils, or artifacts shall not be damaged or disturbed. If any such resources are encountered, the permittee shall notify BLM immediately.
3. Salt and/or mineral supplements will not be placed within ¼ mile of any riparian area, wet meadow, or temporary or permanent watering facility. Excess salt and/or mineral sources will be removed from the allotment following grazing use each year.
4. Temporary water hauling site locations shall be coordinated with the BLM. Troughs associated with these sites must have a wildlife escape ramp. To prevent wildlife deaths, these troughs must be removed or turned over each year when they are no longer needed for livestock grazing use.
5. The permittee shall provide the Bureau of Land Management with reasonable administrative access across private and leased lands for the orderly management and protection of the public lands.
6. When poisonous plants are identified as a threat to livestock, management actions to avoid grazing the area during the problem period would be developed. Infestations of noxious weeds would be incorporated into the Field Office noxious weed control program as they are identified.
7. Grazing use for the allotment would be in compliance with the Gunnison Resource Area RMP, which was amended to adopt the Colorado Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock in Colorado.
8. Grazing use would be in conformance with Canada lynx habitat standards:
  - a. Do not allow livestock use in openings created by fire or timber harvest that would delay successful regeneration of the shrub and tree components.
  - b. Manage grazing in aspen stands to ensure sprouting and sprout survival sufficient to perpetuate the long-term viability of the clones.
  - c. Within the elevational ranges that encompass forested lynx habitat, shrub-steppe habitats should be considered as integral to the lynx habitat matrix and should be managed to maintain or achieve mid-seral or higher condition.

d. Within lynx habitat, manage livestock grazing in riparian areas and willow carrs to maintain or achieve mid-seral or higher condition to provide cover and forage for prey species.

9. All range improvements for which the permittee has maintenance responsibility, including fences, troughs, and reservoirs, must be properly maintained prior to livestock turnout. The permittee must notify the BLM prior to beginning any maintenance activities that require the use of heavy equipment, such as tractors, backhoes, or graders. Allotment boundary fences for which the permittee has maintenance responsibility must be maintained every year, even if the pasture is being rested.

#### Allotment Goal

The East Middle Fork Allotment will be managed to provide for a maximum achievable diversity and production of biological resources to improve and sustain habitat for wildlife, to help sustain the economic stability of the permittees, and to allow for quality opportunities for public land users while achieving or making significant progress toward achieving BLM's Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado and conformance to BLM's Guidelines for Livestock Management in Colorado.

#### Allotment Objectives

##### a. Native Uplands

The management objective for native upland vegetation on the East Middle Fork Allotment is to maintain or improve the vigor, production and diversity of desirable plants to support a variety of resource uses, including, but not limited to livestock grazing, wildlife habitat, and recreation. Native upland sites will be managed to achieve and maintain basal cover values which are equal to or greater than those listed for the slightly/moderately accelerated erosion threshold as described in the Montrose District Soil Erosion Monitoring Guidelines for each ecological site.

##### b. Riparian Areas

Riparian areas will be managed to maintain or achieve a mid-seral or later stage of ecological succession and to provide adequate herbaceous plant residue on stream banks and flood plains during seasons when high flows are likely.

#### Monitoring/Evaluation

The BLM would be responsible for implementing the following monitoring/ evaluation requirements:

The monitoring program would include appropriate consultation, cooperation and coordination with the rangeland users, other agencies, and interested publics. Close coordination between the permittees or their representatives, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, and the BLM of all livestock related field monitoring is essential to determine conformity with the terms and conditions of the permits.

Sufficient monitoring data would be collected to determine if management actions are, 1) contributing to the achievement of allotment objectives and the Gunnison Resource Area

Resource Management Plan (RMP) management objectives, 2) achieving or making significant progress toward achieving the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado and conforming to the Colorado Livestock Grazing Management Guidelines.

The intensity and frequency of additional monitoring done on the allotment would be dependent on annual funding allocations and work priorities established for the Gunnison Field Office. Monitoring priorities for the allotment would be determined annually. Guidance provided in BLM Technical References, BLM Manuals, the Gunnison Resource Area Rangeland Monitoring Plan, would be the basis for monitoring/inventory conducted on the allotment. Other appropriate guidance documentation would be considered when establishing, collecting and evaluating data.

Monitoring would include both short-term and long-term studies. Short-term monitoring would include compliance monitoring, actual use data, range readiness when necessary through a joint field inspection with the BLM and the permittees, utilization studies on riparian areas and uplands as well as climate and soil moisture data. Long term monitoring would document and measure trends toward or achievement of objectives over a period of years.

Evaluations may be conducted anytime during the implementation of this proposed action if monitoring data and/or other data support changes to the allotment objectives, management actions or annual permitted use.

#### B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL:

##### 1. No Grazing Alternative

During scoping for other similar proposed actions, input from the public included the addition of a No Grazing Alternative. Under this alternative, no livestock grazing would be authorized for the East Middle Fork Allotment. The No Grazing Alternative was considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis because it would not conform to the Approved Gunnison Resource Area Resource Management Plan/Record of Decision (RMP/ROD). The RMP/ROD identified livestock grazing as an appropriate and suitable use on the East Middle Fork Allotment. In addition, a No Grazing Alternative would not meet the Purpose and Need for Action.

#### C. PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW:

The Proposed Action is subject to, has been reviewed for, and been found to be in conformance with, the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3). The plan conformance review included consideration of Standard Management (pgs. 2-1 to 2-19), Management Unit Prescriptions (pgs. 2-19 to 2-39), and Standards for Public Land Health (pgs. 4-7).

Name of Plan: Gunnison Resource Area Resource Management Plan (including Adoption of Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management in Colorado)

Date Approved: February 1993 (amended February 1997)

Management Unit(s): 16 (general resource lands)

Decision Number/Page:

Standard Management Direction, pg. 2-1 to 2-12 and 3-1 to 3-8;

Decision Language: (pg. 3-5) “Grazing permits specifying the season of use, number, and kind of livestock will be issued to each operator for each allotment. Operators will have to obtain BLM approval before changing the grazing specifications outlined in their permits.”

Management Unit 16 Direction, pgs. 2-38 to 2-39, 3-15.

### **III. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

A. Cultural Resources – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on cultural resources?

Affected Environment

Range permit renewals are federal undertakings (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(y)) that fall under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Range improvements associated with the allotment (*e.g.*, fences, spring improvements, construction of permanent water structures, etc.) are subject to compliance requirements under Section 106 and will undergo standard cultural resource inventory and evaluation procedures. During Section 106 review, a cultural resource assessment was completed for the allotment (CR Report 09GN020) following the procedures and guidance outlined in the following: The 1980 National Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Livestock Grazing and Range Improvement Program, Instructional Memorandum (IM)-WO-99-039, IM-CO-99-007, IM-CO-99-019 and IM-CO-2001-026. BLM Manuals and Colorado Protocol between the BLM and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO 1998) provide guidance in meeting BLM's responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act. The results of these assessments are summarized below. Copies of the cultural resource assessment are located in the archaeological files at the Gunnison Field Office. Cultural resources are fragile, non-renewable and significant sites and are protected by law, and various regulations.

The cultural resources in the Gunnison Field Office span approximately 12,000 years and are represented by Paleo-Indian, Archaic, Formative, Ute and Euro-American cultures. Sites include lithic scatters, quarries, temporary camps, extended camps, village, rock shelters, rock art, wickiups, scarred trees, hunting sites, kill/butchering sites, processing areas, tree platforms, eagle traps, vision quest sites, caves, trails, roads, water resource sites, homesteads, ranches, cabins, mills, railroads, transmission lines, mines, trash dumps, aspen art, isolated artifacts, graves, etc. Many of these sites have the potential to be directly affected and impacted by livestock grazing. Continued grazing may cause substantial ground disturbance and cause cumulative, long term, irreversible adverse effects to significant cultural properties.

On 2/25/2010 the Gunnison Field Office mailed letters and maps to the Ute Mountain Ute, Southern Ute, and the Ute Indian Tribes, identifying all proposed 2010 grazing permit renewals. No comments were received by this office.

Environmental Consequences and Mitigation:

Many cultural resources have the potential to be directly affected and impacted by livestock grazing and related activities, such as pipeline construction, water trough placement and location

of salt/mineral blocks. Grazing has the potential to cause substantial ground disturbance and cause cumulative, long term, irreversible adverse effects to significant cultural properties. Most commonly, grazing impacts to cultural resources result in accelerated erosion, which causes deflation of buried features and artifacts; displacement of artifacts is also common in areas of cattle concentration. Cattle also may adversely affect rock art and standing structures through rubbing and trampling.

Any known historic sites that are located where livestock concentrate will be field visited to assess and monitor livestock grazing impacts. If adverse effects are found, mitigation measures will need to be implemented. These can include, but are not exclusively limited to, a decrease in the AUMs, construction of fenced exclosures around the sites, excavation of the sites and/or installation of erosion control devices. If future cultural resource inventories identify significant sites, the sites will need to be monitored to determine if adverse effects are occurring to the sites. The livestock impacts will be assessed within the ten year period of the permit.

#### Proposed Action

No known significant resources have been discovered in the allotment and no areas of livestock concentration on BLM lands have been identified. Based on the lack of concentration areas within the allotment, no additional archeological inventory is necessary for the renewal of the grazing permit.

There are currently no known areas of Native American Religious Concern located within this allotment.

B. Migratory Birds – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on migratory birds?

#### Affected Environment

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 was passed to regulate the taking of native birds. In 2001, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13186 (66 FR 3853), which directs federal agencies to further implement the MBTA by considering the effects of projects and actions on migratory birds. Pursuant to this Executive Order, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM and Forest Service are working on a Memorandum of Understanding which requires agencies to review the US Fish and Wildlife Service *Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC)* for species that may inhabit a project area. When reviewing the effects of projects/actions on migratory birds, species on the BCC list are emphasized. Bird species on the list for the Southern Rockies/Colorado Plateau region which could breed within this proposed project area include the flammulated owl (*Otus flammeolus*), Black-throated gray warbler (*Dendroica nigrescens*), Red-naped sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus nuchalis*), Olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*), Hammonds flycatcher (*Empidonax hammondi*), Williamsons sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus thyroideus*), Band-tailed pigeon (*Patagioenas fasciata*), and Violet green swallow (*Tachycineta thalassina*). Williamson's sapsuckers, flammulated owls, Lewis woodpeckers, and Violet green swallows are all cavity nesters that may nest within the scattered mixed conifer/aspen stands or riparian areas. The Black-throated gray warbler spends its spring and fall amongst piñon-juniper, scrub oak, riparian lowlands (cottonwoods [*Populus*], willows [*Salix*], tamarisk [*Tamarix*]), and riparian transition (cottonwood, willow, and alder [*Alnus*]) habitats ([Kingery](#)

1988). Nesting occurs off the ground in the midstory branches of Douglas fir–oak forest. Red-naped sapsucker habitat is composed of aspen, willows and cottonwoods. There is a preference for aspen groves in open rangeland, birch groves, montane coniferous forests and subalpine forest edges. Aspen groves that lack a nearby willow riparian habitat are rejected. The Olive-sided flycatcher and the Hammond’s flycatcher nest high in the trees of coniferous and aspen forests.

Environmental Consequences and Mitigation:

Livestock grazing will not directly affect cavity and tree nesting species including flammulated owls, Williamson’s sapsuckers, Hammond’s flycatcher, Olive-sided flycatcher, Violet-green swallow, and Red-naped sapsucker. Therefore, no take of these species or their nests is expected to occur as a result of grazing under this alternative.

C. Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on threatened, endangered, and sensitive species?

Affected Environment /Environmental Consequences and Mitigation:

Of the threatened, endangered and sensitive species within the Gunnison Field Office, those that warrant discussion are Canada lynx, Gunnison sage grouse, and bald eagle. Canada lynx is threatened under the endangered species act while Gunnison sage grouse and bald eagle are BLM sensitive species.

Canada lynx

The East Middle Fork Allotment overlaps with less than 1% of the Blue/Pine Creek Lynx Analysis Unit (LAU). This LAU is comprised of 66,185 acres. Approximately 62 acres of the East Middle Fork Allotment lies within this LAU, with 0 acres mapped as “winter/denning” lynx habitat. The East Middle Fork Allotment also contains 18 acres categorized as “other” and 35 acres mapped as “winter”. These are the large contiguous tracts of trees and are mainly dominated by Douglas fir and aspen. Based upon inspection of the allotments in 2008, higher elevation lynx habitat within the grazing allotments generally appears healthy with good structural complexity including grass, forbs, shrub and tree components. Species diversity is generally high with native species being dominant.

Gunnison sage grouse

There are no known Gunnison sage grouse leks within this allotment.

Bald eagle

The East Middle Fork allotment does not contain Bald eagle winter concentration corridors.

D. Rangeland Management – What effect would the proposed action or alternatives have on the livestock grazing system associated with the East Middle Fork Allotment?

Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences and Mitigation:



The mandatory terms and conditions on this permit would change from 5 cows from 6/15 to 10/14 at 100% public land (20 AUMs) to 55 cows from 6/15 to 10/14 at 9% public land (20 AUMs). The permittee uses this allotment in rotation with his private land and his permit on the Pine Mesa Allotment. The number of cattle and percent public land is changed under the proposed action to reflect the actual numbers of livestock that graze on the private lands contained within the East Middle Fork Allotment, in conjunction with the public lands. As a result, there would be no increase or decrease in livestock use on the allotment, and there would be no impact to the livestock grazing permittee or the livestock grazing system associated with the East Middle Fork Allotment.

#### E. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY:

The cumulative effects of drought, excessive big game use, and historic livestock grazing use are generally concerns in many grazing allotments throughout the Gunnison Basin. However, the livestock grazing management in the East Middle Fork Allotment has resulted in, and is expected to continue to maintain, satisfactory conditions in plant vigor and productivity and vegetative cover. The land health standards on this allotment are all being met and are expected to continue being met.

#### IV. TRIBES, INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS, OR AGENCIES CONSULTED:

On August 3, 2009, scoping letters requesting any information concerning the allotment were sent to the permittee and 83 other entities, including:

Colorado Division of Wildlife	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Colorado State Forest Service	USDI National Park Service
WildEarth Guardians	Western Watersheds Project
High Country Citizen's Alliance	Colorado Native Plant Society
Trout Unlimited	Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance
Biodiversity Conservation Alliance	Central Colorado Wilderness Coalition
Colorado Mountain Club	Rocky Mountain Resource Management Services
Grand Valley Audubon Society	Gunnison County Stock-Grower's Association, Inc.
National Wildlife Federation	Backcountry Snow Sports Alliance
Center for Native Ecosystems	Colorado Environmental Coalition
Colorado Wild	Defenders of Wildlife
Great Old Broads for Wilderness	Quiet Use Coalition
San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council	Sierra Club, Rocky Mountain Chapter
Western Environmental Law Center	Wilderness Workshop
Environment Colorado	Natural Resources Defense Council
San Juan Citizens Alliance	Sheep Mountain Alliance
Western Colorado Congress	Western Resource Advocates
The Wilderness Society	Winter Wildlands Alliance
Board of Grazing Advisors	Rocky Mountain Biological Lab
Colorado Cattlemens Association	Western Slope Environmental Resource Council
Bill Parker	Double Heart, LLC
Jim Cochran	Owsley Ranch, LLLP
Wilbur and Ann Watson	Wayne Maurer
Dawn Delany	David Davidson

CR and JM Shaver, LLLP	Ronald Lee McCutchin
Kruger Ranch Co.	Donald, Debra, Ronald Masden
Vickers Brothers	Peterson Ranch, Inc.
Deldorita Ranches, Inc.	Gateview Ranch, Inc.
Joseph P. Taramarcas	Ron and Wanda Brink
Spann Ranches, Inc.	Lamar Norsworthy
Poverty Mesa, LLLP	Robert N. Sharpe
David, Scott, Reni, John, Jeff Gorsuch	August Nicolas Family Partnership, LLLP
Steve Bonnell	Rudy and Deb Rudibaugh
Jerry Smith	Juan and Donna Inda
Perry Hazard	4C Ranch, LLC
R & K Farm	Guerrieri Land & Cattle Inc.
Burton J. Bullington	Mineral Creek Ranch and Investment, LLC
John Judson	David J. McLain
Tracy Hildreth	Field Land and Cattle Co. LLC
Ron Bombard	Gilbert J. Howell, Jr.
Ward Ranches, Inc.	Cement Creek, LLC
Gene Hollenbeck	Nicolas Livestock

Of the entities contacted, the permittee, one individual, and two organizations (Gunnison County Stockgrowers and Rocky Mountain Resource Management Services) responded that they wished to remain informed of actions planned for the allotment.

#### **V. LIST OF PREPARERS:**

Name	Title	Area(s) of Responsibility
Russell Japuntich	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species Terrestrial Wildlife
Elizabeth Francisco	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources Native American Religious Concerns
Cynthia Landing	Rangeland Management Specialist	Noxious Weeds Range Management
Tara de Valois	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range Management Interdisciplinary Team Lead

**APPENDIX A**  
**INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST**

**NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-CO-S060-2010-0017-EA

**PROJECT NAME:** East Middle Fork Allotment #06030 Grazing Permit Issuance

**DETERMINATION OF STAFF:** (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NA = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PA = present and requires further analysis because 1) analysis of the issue is necessary to make a reasoned choice between alternatives, or 2) analysis of the issue is necessary to determine the significance of impacts.

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section C of the DNA form.

<b>PHYSICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Air Quality</b> (Clean Air Act)	Determination	Signature:	Date:
	NA	<i>Andrew Breitbart</i>	<i>03/03/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: Livestock grazing has a negligible effect on air quality in the project area.		
<b>Geology/Minerals</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	NA	<i>David Lazorchak</i>	<i>03/02/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: Livestock grazing has no effect on geologic or mineral resources in the project area.		
<b>Paleontology</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	NA	<i>Elizabeth Francisco</i>	<i>4/16/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: Livestock grazing has no effect on paleontological resources in the project area.		
<b>Soils</b> (includes Public Land Health Standard 1)	Determination	Signature	Date
	NA	<i>Andrew Breitbart</i>	<i>3/3/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		
<b>Floodplains</b> (EO11988)	Determination	Signature	Date
	NP	<i>Andrew Breitbart</i>	<i>3/3/2010</i>
<b>Water Quality (drinking/ground)</b> (Clean Water Act and others) (includes Public Land Health Standard 5)	Determination	Signature	Date
	NA	<i>Andrew Breitbart</i>	<i>3/3/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		

<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Fire and Fuels Management</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<b>Dave Kinader</b>	<b>4/5/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: Livestock grazing may reduce fuel loads in light flashy fuels however this is not a significant issue.		
<b>Invasive, Non-native Species</b> (Federal Noxious Weed Act and EO 13112)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Tara de Valois</i>	<b>3/2/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: No noxious weeds were found on the allotment, and it is not anticipated that the proposed action will encourage establishment of invasive, non-native species on the allotment		
<b>Forest Vegetation</b> (includes Public Land Health Standard 3)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Brian Brown</i>	<b>2/2/10</b>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		
<b>Upland Vegetation</b> (includes Public Land Health Standard 3)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Tara M. de Valois</i>	<b>3/2/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		
<b>Riparian Zones and Wetlands</b> (EO 11990) (includes Public Land Health Standard 2)	Determination	Signature:	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Andrew Breibart</i>	<b>3/3/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		
<b>Wildlife</b> (includes Public Land Health Standard 3)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Russell Lapuntich</i>	<b>3/3/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		
<b>Migratory Birds</b> (EO 13186 and Migratory Bird Treaty Act)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Russell Lapuntich</i>	<b>3/3/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment.		
<b>Threatened, Endangered, Candidate (ESA), and/or Sensitive Animal Species</b> (includes Public Land Health Standard 4)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>PA</b>	<i>Russell Lapuntich</i>	<b>3/3/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: This standard is being met in the allotment, but the issue will be carried forward for analysis to demonstrate compliance with ESA and Sec. 107 consultation.		

<b>HERITAGE RESOURCES and HUMAN ENVIRONMENT</b>			
<b>Cultural Resources</b> (National Historic Preservation Act)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>PA</b>	<i>Elizabeth Francisco</i>	<i>4/16/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: This issue will be carried forward for analysis to demonstrate compliance with NHPA and Sec. 106 consultation.		
<b>Environmental Justice</b> (EO 12898)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Tara M. de Valois</i>	<i>3/2/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: The proposed action has no disproportionate impact on any racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group.		
<b>Native American Religious Concerns</b> (American Indian Religious Freedom Act)	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Elizabeth Francisco</i>	<i>4/16/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: No Native American religious concerns have been identified in the project area.		
<b>Socio-economics</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Tara M. de Valois</i>	<i>3/2/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: The proposed action has no effect on socioeconomics in the project area, including on the individual permittee.		
<b>Visual Resources</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Sally Thode</i>	<i>3/4/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: The proposed action is in a Visual Resource Management Class 4. The proposed action would have no effect on visual resources in the project area.		
<b>Wastes (hazardous or solid) (RCRA and CERCLA)</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>David Lazorchak</i>	<i>03/02/2010</i>
	Rationale for Determination: There were no hazardous or solid wastes identified on public land in the project area.		

<b>LAND USES and SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS</b>			
<b>Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (FLPMA)</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Sally Thode</i>	<b>3/4/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: There are no designated ACEC's in the project area.		
<b>Farmlands (Prime or Unique) (SMCRA and Farmland Protection Policy Act)</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Marnie Medina</i>	<b>4/2/10</b>
	Rationale for Determination: There are no prime or unique farmlands in the project area.		
<b>Lands/Realty Authorizations</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Marnie Medina</i>	<b>4/2/10</b>
	Rationale for Determination: There are no lands/realty authorizations in the project area.		
<b>Rangeland Management</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>PA</b>	<i>Tara M. de Valois</i>	<b>3/2/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: The proposed action continues current management and so has no effect on rangeland management. However, the mandatory terms and conditions on the permit have been changed, so rangeland management is discussed above.		
<b>Recreation</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Sally Thode</i>	<b>3/4/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: The proposed action would have no effect on recreation in the project area.		
<b>Access and Transportation</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NA</b>	<i>Sally Thode</i>	<b>3/4/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: The proposed action has no effect on access in the project area.		
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers (Wild and Scenic Rivers Act)</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Sally Thode</i>	<b>3/4/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: There are no designated wild or scenic rivers in the project area.		
<b>Wilderness (FLPMA and Wilderness Act)</b>	Determination	Signature	Date
	<b>NP</b>	<i>Sally Thode</i>	<b>3/4/2010</b>
	Rationale for Determination: There is no designated Wilderness or Wilderness Study Area (WSA) in the project area. Therefore, there is no effect on Wilderness.		

**FINAL REVIEW:**

<b>Reviewer Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
NEPA Coordinator	<i>Marnie Medina</i>	1/24/11	
Field Manager	Brian St. George	1/31/11	

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Gunnison Field Office  
DOI-BLM-CO-S060-2010-0017-EA**

**FONSI  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the referenced environmental assessment, and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement is not necessary.

**RATIONALE**

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Gunnison Field Office (GFO) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-CO-S060-2010-0017-EA to analyze the effects of issuing a 10-year permit for livestock grazing in the East Middle Fork Allotment.

The EA analyzed potential site-specific impacts on resources that would result from implementing the proposed action or alternatives. The analysis addressed whether or not the proposed action and alternatives would: 1) address public lands that are failing to achieve the Public Land Health Standards and/or not conforming to the Guidelines for Livestock Management in Colorado due to livestock grazing (43 CFR 4180.2 (c)); and, 2) assure compliance with the objectives of the Approved Gunnison Resource Area Resource Management Plan (RMP).

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:**      /s/ Brian St. George  
Brian St. George, Gunnison Field Manager

**DATE SIGNED:**      1/31/11